

In the passion within myself I hope to portray my feelings of protest with going forward with a plan that is too broad. There are benefits to look at the future of our forests, though I feel this plan can be downsized and take a closer focus of the diversity that is amongst the forest. We have a responsibility towards the future generations and climate to protect the habitat of the animals that dwell in our forest and to offer tranquility what a forest has to offer.

The energy of what a forest is has become depleted by motorized encroachment in vehicles that leave no territory untouched. The noise pollution seems as though it is taking a toll on the animals as well as the invasiveness. There is also the encroachment of housing, yes, we all want our homes protected during wildfire. That being said when one comes to live near the forest edge we must take on the responsibility of that what comes with the territory, so to speak. Thus, firefighting and defending of homes should not be foremost on the top of priorities when we take a look at what the future of the forest is, embedded within gratefully but utmost no. There are many steps one can take to try to defend their homes, and again accept what comes with the territory.

A concern over water quality that filters in with fires in our forest, is there another way to alleviate this issue rather than the sweeping clean of the habitat around these resources?

My hope is that there can be a deeper look into how to manage recreationalists in the forest. There is the argument that the forests are there for humans to enjoy, but.....how the times and the definition of enjoying the forest has changed. I am pretty sure the percentage of the fires in the general area are human caused. Can there not be some of this energy and resources put forth to pave the way to better inform the public about their responsibility to using the forest, enforcement of these ideas, and an encompassing look at what the focus could/should be from our forest and it's inhabitants. I believe habitat to be at the top of the list, to preserve the dwindling wildlife, to deal with the flow of what is happening in the specific areas. The area promoted in this large plan, has unique areas that have specific issues that time well spent can improve what issues arise. In our world of profitability one cannot help but wonder if this plays into this plan. Our recreational sports in the forest the past 30 years has made a crescendo towards an unimaginable amount of disturbance to the plants, trees, and wildlife. Would it not be wise to consider trying to manage and enforce some sort of action in this direction rather than what feels like a decimation of the forest on such a large scale as the LAVA plan,?

I am a landowner on the edge of the national forest. We have taken steps to make our home defendable, be it possible. I am also on the edge of Sheep Mountain Federal Big Game Refuge, I am disappointed with the progress made in the last few years towards the Refuge being bundled into a plan the size of the LAVA plan. To ignore that an area is a Refuge and not take advantage of managing it to give "refuge" to animals and to improve the habitat along with a study. Small steps forward are wiped off the slate with this plan. With this area set aside for the animals back in 1924, why it is that 3000 acres is not managed as such?

This plan is too big and too vague, enough words to state my opinion of the LAVA plan.